

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

Claims 10, 18 and 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Kondou (US 5,021,888). In addition, claims 1-2, 5-10 and 12-16 are allowed.

Applicant has amended claim 17 to overcome the rejection. Applicant has also canceled claims 10 and 19 and amended claim 18 to overcome the objections. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-2, 5-9 and 12-18 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Objections

Claims 10, 18 and 19 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Applicant has canceled claims 10 and 19, and claim 18 is amended as “wherein said image sensing device is disposed on said second flexible circuit board” to overcome the objections.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102 (b)

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Kondou (US 5,021,888).

Applicant has amended claim 17 with the addition of “the image sensing device is directly stacked on the signal processing device such that the image sensing device contacts with the signal processing device”. The limitation added in claim 17 is shown in FIG. 7, and thus no new matter is entered.

Applicant respectfully submits Kondou fails to teach “the image sensing device is directly stacked on the signal processing device such that the image sensing device contacts with the signal processing device” as claim 17 recites. In FIG. 5 of the citation, the imaging element 10 is disposed on the FPC 31 and contacts with the FPC 32, and the chip component 13 is disposed on the FPC 32. Obviously, the imaging element 10 is not directly stacked on the chip component 13. The imaging element 10 and the chip component 13 are separated from each other, and thus they do not contact to each other.




FIG. 5

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits Kondou fails to each and every element as recited in claim 17. Independent claim 17 patently defines over the prior art reference, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claim 18 patently defines over the prior art as a matter of law, for at least the reason that the dependent claim contain all features of its independent claim.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Date: 2-17-2009

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330